United Nations A/C.2/62/SR.33

General Assembly
Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
9 January 2008

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 33rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday 7 December, 2007, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Lintonen ..... (Finland)

Contents

Agenda item 53: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 56: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) Preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (*continued*)

Agenda item 57: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 59: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(c) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 52: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt crisis and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 56: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) Science and technology for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 58: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(c) Human resources development (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-63181 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 53: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development (*continued*)
(A/C.2/62/L.37 and L.59)

Draft resolution on the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus

1. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.59, which was being submitted by her, the Chairperson, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.37. It contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt), speaking in his capacity as facilitator and also on behalf of the other facilitator, Mr. Løvald (Norway), introduced the draft resolution, noting that it set the exact dates of the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development based on information received from the Government of Qatar. Other changes to paragraph 1 concerned the level of the Review Conference, the level of participation, the outcome document and the modalities of Review Conference meetings. The draft also highlighted the important role of major institutional stakeholders in both the preparatory process and the Review Conference itself.

3. Paragraph 9 was one of the most delicate balances in the entire draft. The aim had been to avoid any financial implications — for which he was grateful to the President of the General Assembly for his determination to accommodate the consultation and drafting processes within existing resources — while at the same time responding to the need to conduct a structured review of the six thematic areas of the Monterrey Consensus in a predictable manner so as to allow for the participation of experts from capitals and relevant stakeholders, with a view to producing the first draft outcome document by the end of July 2008. That draft would provide the basis for the consultations and drafting processes to be held from early September until the Review Conference. The timetable set out in the paragraph reflected the most delicate balance possible between various positions.

4. Every effort would be made and every available resource used to ensure that the preparatory process was a success. He trusted that the spirit of cooperation, understanding and flexibility that had characterized negotiations on the draft resolution would prevail, leading to a successful Review Conference. Lastly, after drawing attention to a number of minor drafting changes, he recommended the draft resolution for adoption.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.59, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

6. **Ms. Ayesha** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group of 77 and China had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because it attached great importance to the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development and the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus. She was confident that the Review Conference would provide a platform to meaningfully address global economic imbalances and inequities, assess progress made, reaffirm goals and commitments, share best practices and lessons learned, identify obstacles and constraints encountered and design actions and initiatives to overcome them, and, lastly, pinpoint new challenges and emerging issues. The Group of 77 and China wished to participate in the Conference at the summit level and encouraged all Member States to participate at the highest possible political level, including at the level of Heads of State or Government.

7. The Group welcomed the road map for the Review Conference's preparatory process but was disappointed that not enough time had been allocated for informal consultations on the outcome document. It expected negotiations on that document to begin as early as possible so as to give delegations time to carefully examine the issues and contribute substantively to the outcome. The Group was committed to advancing the global discourse on financing for development and working towards a result-oriented, negotiated and positive outcome.

8. **Ms. Gomes** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine, welcomed the consensus reached on the modalities of the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus. Significant concessions had been made by all parties, but with an end result that the European Union was

comfortable standing behind. The European Union had made it clear throughout the negotiations that it was in favour of a ministerial-level conference. The language just adopted left the decision regarding the level of participation with Member States. The European Union was pleased, therefore, that each Government would take a sovereign decision regarding how it wished to be represented in Doha.

9. The resolution also set in motion a preparatory process that was flexible and responsive to the Review Conference's needs. The European Union looked forward to the substantive discussions on the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus. In order to have the largest impact possible, those meetings should be well planned, bearing in mind the need to take account of the Organization's existing calendar of work in 2008, and should benefit from the technical input and active participation of all relevant stakeholders in the six thematic areas of the Consensus. The fact that delegations had been able to accommodate a process that did not have any programme budget implications was important to the European Union. In that context, she expressed appreciation to the President of the General Assembly for his efforts to accommodate the needs of the process in such a way that did not incur any additional costs to the regular budget.

10. The outcome of the Review Conference should be short and political in nature and focus on the reaffirmation of the Monterrey Consensus and on how to promote its further implementation. Emerging issues would also be integral to the discussion. The European Union looked forward to identifying key issues that had arisen from the changing development cooperation landscape since the adoption of the Monterrey Consensus, and to further considerations on the content of the final outcome of the Review Conference in due time.

11. She welcomed the fact that the major institutional stakeholders, civil society and the business sector and other stakeholders would be invited to participate in the Review Conference in the same way that they had in Monterrey. The decision reflected the truly collaborative process that had been borne through the preparations for and follow-up to the International Conference on Financing for Development.

12. The European Union looked forward to the President of the General Assembly providing, as soon as feasible, the programme of work for the preparatory process, so as to enable delegations to ensure the most appropriate participation in those meetings, and to the Secretary-General's note on the organization of work of the Review Conference.

13. Lastly, the Committee should make every effort in 2008 to complete its work before the Review Conference and should focus its work during the second semester of 2008 in the macroeconomic and financing for development cluster on ensuring that the Review Conference was a success.

14. **Mr. Heidt** (United States of America) said that a thorough, substantive review of the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus was crucial, since the Consensus was extremely important for the United Nations and had delivered concrete benefits for many of its Member States. Through its power to convene a global development community, the United Nations had carved out an important role for itself in the development finance debate. For those reasons, a successful outcome of the Review Conference based on an objective review of the Monterrey Consensus was critical for the United Nations, developing countries and development partners alike. Noting that the review would entail a considerable amount of work in an already busy year, he encouraged the co-facilitators to convene an informal meeting in the near future so that Member States could begin planning for what he hoped would be a very productive year. The United States looked forward to engaging fully in that process as a further sign of its strong commitment.

15. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.37 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 56: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) Preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.27 and L.61)

Draft resolution on preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption

16. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.61, which was being submitted by Mr. Saleh (Lebanon), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held

on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.27. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

17. **Mr. Siregar** (Indonesia), speaking in his capacity as facilitator, recalled that, at the previous meeting of the Committee, a number of minor drafting changes had been introduced in paragraphs 5 and 7 and paragraph 9 had been deleted. In addition, in paragraph 20, the words "Nusa Dua, Indonesia" should be reinserted in the third line and the word "promoting" replaced by "enhancing".

18. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.61, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

19. **Mr. Young** (United States of America), explaining his delegation's position, said that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because it strongly supported the goal of preventing and combating corruption. The United Nations Convention against Corruption was a vital tool in the fight against corruption. His delegation supported those elements of the resolution that highlighted its importance. That fight was also a shared problem and States must work together to find common solutions.

20. His delegation was disappointed, however, that the title and certain portions of the resolution did not reflect accurately the principles and language of the Convention. Specifically, they repeatedly condemned the "transfer" of assets of illicit origin and treated the "transfer" of such assets and the laundering of such assets as separate crimes. The Convention, however, required parties to criminalize the laundering of assets of illicit origin, not the act of transferring assets per se. The resolution also implied that the laundered proceeds of corruption must always be returned to the country of origin. The Convention sought to facilitate and promote the return of such proceeds, but clearly recognized the principle that assets should be returned to "prior legitimate owners", which could include countries of origin.

21. The United Nations Convention against Corruption was the product of over two years of intense negotiations among experts from over 130 countries. Chapter V of the Convention provided a groundbreaking and internationally recognized framework for international cooperation in asset recovery cases. The Convention enjoyed widespread support with 140 signatories and 104 parties. The States parties to the Convention were actively engaged in implementing the Convention's provisions through the Conference of the States Parties. His delegation did not wish to see such efforts or the Convention's principles undermined by the repeated negotiation of a resolution — particularly one that undercut the Convention's framework for asset recovery cooperation — at future sessions of the General Assembly. He urged Member States to respect the primacy of the Conference of the States Parties and to refrain from introducing the resolution at the sixty-third session of the General Assembly.

22. **Ms. Baumgarten** (Canada), explaining her delegation's position, said that Canada had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because it was committed to delivering greater accountability in Government and combating the crime and costs of corruption, which undermined democracy, human rights and the rule of law worldwide.

23. The United Nations Convention against Corruption was expected to become the most important and widely applied international instrument for combating corruption. Her Government attached considerable importance to the role of the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention as the primary body for its implementation and hoped that the second session of the Conference of the States Parties, to be held in Indonesia in January 2008, would be an opportunity to move forward the Convention's implementation, in particular its review, asset recovery, technical assistance and preventive measures.

24. However, as more and more countries ratified and acceded to the Convention and the momentum behind the Conference of the States Parties increased, the need for political guidance from the General Assembly diminished. Her delegation would therefore be in favour of considering the resolution biennially, as a minimum.

25. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.27 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 57: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.24 and L. 58)

Draft resolution on the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

26. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.58, which was being submitted by

Ms. Tchitanava (Georgia), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.24. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

27. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.58 was adopted.*

28. **Ms. Ayesha** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, noted that, in paragraph 22 of the resolution, the General Assembly had agreed to hold the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries towards the end of the current decade. In that connection, the Secretary-General should include in his note details of the modalities of such a conference, including its preparatory process, and consult widely with Member States regarding the venue of the conference.

29. **Mr. Silvestre** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Georgia and Moldova, welcomed the consensus that had been reached on the draft resolution just adopted. While graduation from the list of least developed countries should be considered as a positive achievement, it was important to ensure a smooth transition that allowed the graduating countries time to prepare for full integration into the global economy without disruptions to their development plans and programmes. The European Union therefore stood ready to help those countries adjust to the phasing out of their status as least developed countries, including within the framework of a smooth transition strategy.

30. Much more remained to be done to help least developed countries overcome the vicious cycle of poverty and misery. The advocacy strategy for the effective and timely implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010 was extremely important in that regard and the European Union reiterated its willingness to participate in that strategy as an active stakeholder. The Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, to be held at the end of the decade, would be a valuable opportunity to share experiences, exchange good practices and compare assessments of the difficulties faced in implementing all of the commitments under the aforementioned Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries. The European Union therefore looked forward to considering the report to be issued by the Secretary-General during the current session outlining the modalities for that Conference.

31. **Mr. Alim** (Bangladesh), speaking on behalf of the Group of Least Developed Countries, welcomed the consensus outcome achieved on the draft resolution and expressed confidence that the next programme of action would be adopted in a timely manner. However, while some progress had been made in the area of good governance, resource mobilization issues remained a major challenge.

32. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.24 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 59: Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

(c) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.3 and L.54)

Draft resolution on South-South cooperation

33. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.54, which was being submitted by Mr. Hassan Ali Saleh (Lebanon), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.3. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.54 was adopted.*

35. **Mr. Desmoures** (Argentina) welcomed the constructive participation of delegations in the consultations for a high-level United Nations conference on South-South cooperation on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries to be held shortly in Buenos Aires. His delegation looked forward to participating actively in the preparatory work for that event.

36. **Ms. Ferreira** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Moldova and Ukraine, welcomed the consensus that had been reached on the draft resolution just adopted, which stressed that South-South cooperation remained an important element in the collective pursuit of

economic growth and development. The European Union was pleased to note that a number of developed countries were already applying strong programmes in support of South-South cooperation. Such cooperation with emerging economies was important, particularly for a more equitable world order and for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. South-South cooperation was an integral part of global efforts for development. It should therefore comply with the essential principles enshrined in both the Monterrey Consensus and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

37. Further efforts were clearly required to better understand the potential of South-South cooperation to enhance development effectiveness. The European Union therefore looked forward to agreeing the modalities for the forthcoming high-level United Nations conference on South-South Cooperation decided upon by the present draft resolution. The European Union recognized the potential for the United Nations to play an increased role in strengthening funding partnerships among developing countries, particularly for the achievement of the internationally agreed developing goals, including the Millennium Development Goals. In that context, the European Union would continue to support South-South initiatives, including through triangular cooperation.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.3 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 52: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt crisis and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.2 and L.57)

Draft resolution entitled "External debt and development: towards a durable solution to the debt problem of developing countries"

39. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.57, which was being submitted by Mr. Peter Alexander Le Roux (South Africa), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.2. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

40. **Mr. Le Roux** (South Africa) proposed some minor corrections to paragraph 6 and 17 of the draft resolution.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.57, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

42. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that the United States strongly supported the Monterrey Consensus, which affirmed that debt was an important part of the development finance equation and that debt sustainability required national strategies for managing liabilities, as well as good governance and sound domestic macroeconomic policies.

43. Much had been done to address the debt problems of developing countries in the past few years. The Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative had provided 24 debtors nearly $42 billion in debt forgiveness. In addition, creditors participating in the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative had granted an additional $45 billion in debt relief to 22 countries that had successfully completed targeted poverty reduction strategies. Another nine countries had entered the HIPC process and should benefit from an additional $18 billion in HIPC debt relief upon completion of their economic reform programmes.

44. The United States had been a leader in promoting debt relief to countries eligible for the HIPC initiative and to the low-income countries included in the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative. Indeed, the United States had gone beyond the HIPC framework by forgiving 100 per cent of eligible bilateral debts for countries that met their commitments under the HIPC initiative. It had also supported an increase in grant-based financing in countries that were unable to secure adequate financing because of their economic situations.

45. His delegation was pleased that Member States had begun to recognize those accomplishments in the current year's resolution. In confronting difficult challenges, it was important for countries to periodically take stock of their progress, while at the same time renewing their commitments to tackling the challenges of the future. The United Nations could play an important role in helping those countries that benefited from debt relief to strengthen their capacities to manage debt and to recognize that task as an important part of their fiscal policies. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development also played a significant role in that area by providing capacity-building support that should be acknowledged and further encouraged.

46. Debt relief programmes must also focus on poor countries suffering from unsustainable debt. The current resolution called on Member States to foster the political will among creditors, both public and private, to provide comparable treatment to debtor countries that had already worked out sustainable debt relief agreements with the majority of their creditors. By urging comparable treatment, the United Nations was helping countries that sought to manage their debt responsibly and enabling them to use their available resources to invest in development and poverty reduction.

47. His delegation congratulated all development partners, both creditors and debtors alike, for their cooperative spirit in tackling the challenges of debt sustainability for development. It urged continued meaningful discussion and support for effective debt management.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.2 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 56: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) Science and technology for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.26 and L.52)

49. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.52, which was being submitted by Mr. Hassan Ali Saleh (Lebanon), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.26. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

50. **Mr. Saleh** (Lebanon), in recommending the draft resolution for adoption, suggested that the floor might be given to the facilitator of the informal consultations in order for her to present a few changes that had been made to the text already circulated.

51. **Ms. Liko** (Austria), speaking in her capacity as facilitator, proposed three editorial corrections to the text of draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.52: paragraph 3 should become new paragraph 7; the following words should be added to the end of paragraph 8: "under fair, transparent and mutually agreed terms in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare for the benefit of society"; and the whole of paragraph 9 should be deleted.

52. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.52, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

53. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.26 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 58: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(c) Human resources development (*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.32 and L.51)

Draft resolution on human resources development

54. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.51, which was being submitted by Ms. Tamar Tchitanava (Georgia), on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.32. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

55. **Ms. Tchitanava** (Georgia) in recommending the draft resolution for adoption, suggested that the floor might be given to the facilitator of the informal consultations in order for him to present a few changes that had been made to the text already circulated.

56. **Mr. Zilgalvis** (Latvia), speaking in his capacity as facilitator, drew attention to two minor drafting changes to the third preambular paragraph and paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.51, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

58. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.32 was withdrawn.*

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.